

Application Number 10/783,816  
Response to Office Action mailed November 26, 2007

### **REMARKS**

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated November 26, 2007. Applicant has amended claims 8, 10-16, 18, 19 and 22. Claims 1-22 are pending.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1-7, 9 and 17 are allowable in their present form. The Examiner also indicated that claims 1-22 are allowable over the prior art of record, but claims 8, 10-16 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. As described in detail below, Applicant has amended claims 8, 10-16, 18 and 22 to overcome this rejection. Consequently, claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance.

### **Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8, 10-16, and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claims 8, 10-16, 18 and 22 for purposes of clarification. Applicant has also amended claims 18 and 19 to correct typographical errors. Applicant submits that claims 8, 10-16 and 18-22, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner stated that claims 10-16 recite "The method" in the preamble, but independent claim 9, from which claims 10-16 ultimately depend, is directed to a digital storage medium. Applicant has amended claims 10-16 to recite "The digital storage medium" in the preamble.

The Examiner also stated that claims 18 and 22 recite "the series of instructions," which appears to have insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claims 18 and 22 to recite "the series of functions," which has sufficient antecedent basis from independent claim 17 from which claims 18 and 22 ultimately depend.

Finally, the Examiner stated that claims 8 and 16 recite "the Mitchell-Moore Additive generation method," which does not appear to be a published and definite generation method such that the metes and bounds of the claim cannot be determined. As a preliminary comment,

**CENTRAL FAX CENTER****FEB 01 2008**

Application Number 10/783,816  
Response to Office Action mailed November 26, 2007

Applicant has amended claims 8 and 16 to recite "a Mitchell-Moore Additive generation method," which is defined as described by Applicant in the specification. With respect to the rejection, Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill would readily be able to determine the metes and bounds of claims 8 and 16 in view of at least the teachings and description of the Mitchell-Moore Additive generation method provided by Applicant's specification. Moreover, Applicant directs the Examiner to *D. E. Knuth. The Art of Computer Programming, volume 2: Seminumerical algorithms. Addison-Wesley, 3 edition, 1997*, that describes the Mitchell-Moore Algorithm for random number generation.

For at least these reasons, claims 8, 10-16 and 18-22, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

### CONCLUSION

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Date:

By:

2/1/2008  
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.  
1625 Radio Drive, Suite 300  
Woodbury, Minnesota 55125  
Telephone: 651.735.1100  
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

Kent J. Sieffert  
Name: Kent J. Sieffert  
Reg. No.: 41,312